

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections that are contained in the final Office Action of December 10, 2008 is respectfully requested.

Interview with the Examiner

In the final Office Action, the Examiner suggested an interview for the purpose of arriving at mutually satisfactory language in the claims. Examiner Stimpert is thanked for his suggestion, as well as his courtesy in granting and conducting the interview. As a result of the telephone interview with the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted and believed that appropriate language has been arrived at for both independent claims 12 and 17. The substance of the interview will be discussed below.

Amendments to the Specification and Claims

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite "said communication passage opening in a tangential direction of said interior space so that any fluid flowing into said interior space, via said communication passage, from said upper part of said oil-storage chamber is aligned with the direction of revolution at a point of introduction into said interior space." The Examiner's suggestion of the claim language is deemed acceptable, as is the Examiner's suggestion to delete "does not disturb revolution of the fluid." Given the deletion of the reference to the fluid at that point, the following line has also been deleted. Specifically, the following line referred to the revolution of the fluid, which is compressed by the compressing mechanism, being in the interior space. The particular reference to the revolution of the fluid, and the fluid itself, having been deleted, the last line is not necessary.

Claim 17 has been amended to employ the word "circumferential" instead of the word "tangential" when referring to the direction of introduction of fluid by both the feed hole and the communication passage. Thus, in referring to the communication passage, the claim language now reads "with said communication passage opening in said circumferential direction of said interior space so that any fluid flowing into said interior space, via said communication passage, from said

upper part of said oil-storage chamber is introduced to flow in the same said circumferential direction, at a point of introduction into said separation chamber, as the fluid introduced into said interior space through said feed hole is flowing at said point of introduction." The remainder of the claim, referring to the lack of disturbance of revolution of the fluid, has been deleted, similar to the changes to claim 12.

It was agreed with the Examiner that these changes to claims 12 and 17 reflect the intent of Applicants to recite that the communication passage introduces fluid in the same direction circumferentially for the purpose of avoiding disturbance of fluid from the feed hole by introduction of fluid through the communication passage and do not represent a substantial change in the claim scope.

The change to the language discussing the circumferential direction of the interior space of the separation chamber from the tangential direction is clearly supported by the original specification and drawings. Reference may for example be had to the discussion of the feed hole on page 6 of the specification and the communication passage on page 7 of the specification. Reference may also be had to the feed hole 53 and the communication passage 57 in Fig. 1, Fig. 3 and Fig. 7.

Literal support for the claim language that is now used has also been provided at appropriate points on pages 6 and 7 of the specification. These changes reflect the intent of Applicants as discussed above, and do not present new matter. Support, as noted, is clearly found in the original specification and drawings.

The Amended Claims Clearly Define Over the Prior Art Cited by the Examiner

Agreement was reached with the Examiner that upon the entry of these changes to the claims, the claims would define over the prior art of record and the claims would be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is kindly requested to enter the above amendments and allow the application as a whole.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is requested to pass the case to issue. If the

Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Takeo KITAMURA et al.

/Nils E. Pedersen/

By: 2009.03.10 13:05:29 -07'00'

Nils E. Pedersen

Registration No. 33,145

Attorney for Applicants

NEP/krq

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

March 10, 2009